AO 472 (Rev. 3/86) Order of Detention Pending Trial

		United States	S DIST	TRICT COURT
		Dist	trict of	Delaware
		UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		
		V.	OR	DER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL
	_	Tony L. Clark	Case	CRO7-34-SLR
	,	Defendant		
		accordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), a detection of the defendant pending trial in this case.	ention nearti	g has been held. I conclude that the following facts require the
		Part I—F	indings of	
	(1)	o(1) and has been convicted of a federal offense state iving rise to federal jurisdiction had existed that is eath.		
	(3)	§ 3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable state or local offense 2) The offense described in finding (1) was committed while the 3) A period of not more than five years has elapsed since the for the offense described in finding (1).	s. defendant w date of co	nviction release of the defendant from imprisonment ondition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the
			ve Findings	
	(1)	<ol> <li>There is probable cause to believe that the defendant has comfor which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c).</li> </ol>		
	(2)	<ol> <li>The defendant has not rebutted the presumption established by the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of</li> </ol>	the commun	
	(1)		ve Findings	(B)
		<ol> <li>There is a serious risk that the defendant will not appear.</li> <li>There is a serious risk that the defendant will endanger the sa</li> </ol>	fety of anoth	er person or the community.
		Part II—Written Staten	ent of Rea	sons for Detention

I find that the credible testimony and information submitted at the hearing establishes by X clear and convincing evidence X a preponderance of the evidence: that there are no conditions that will reasonably assure defendant's appearance as required and the safety of the community:

- 1. The evidence against defendant is sufficient to support the charge.
- 2. The evidence shows that in response to WPD, defendant fled and attempted to discard the evidence.
- 3. defendant, despite having close proximity to family, has a significant criminal history that began when defendant was age 12-13 years.
- 4. Defendant was convicted of theft of a firearm in September 2002. Prior to that time, 2 capiases were issued for failure to appear, one for trial. by May 2003 he was found VOP.
- 5. In August 2005 defendant was convicted of possession of a controlled substance within 300 feet of a park for which he received probation. He was found VOP in October 2004, January 2006 and against in October 2006 for which he received 3 months imprisonment. He was eventually discharged as unimproved. He was also convicted of possession of cocaine and possession of drug paraphernalia in January 2006, which probably resulted in the VOP in January 2006.



Part III-Directions Regarding Detention

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or his designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility shall deliver the defendant to the United States marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

April 2, 2007

Date

Signature of Judicial Officer

Mary Pat Thynge, Magistrate Judge

Name and Title of Judicial Officer

\*Insert as applicable: (a) Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq.); (b) Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. § 951 et seq.); or (c) Section 1 of Act of Sept. 15, 1980 (21 U.S.C. § 955a).